

OPINION 2228 (Case 3393)***Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838 (Insecta, Coleoptera): name not conserved**

Abstract. A proposal to conserve the generic name *Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838 for a buprestid (jewel beetle) by suppression of its senior subjective synonym *Lasionota* Mannerheim, 1837 was not accepted.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; BUPRESTIDAE; *Dactylozodes*; *Lasionota*; South America; jewel beetles.

Ruling

- (1) It is hereby ruled that the proposal to conserve the generic name *Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838 by suppression of the generic name *Lasionota* Mannerheim, 1837 is not accepted.
- (2) No names are placed on Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

History of Case 3393

An application was received from C.L. Bellamy (*Plant Pest Diagnostics Branch, California Department of Food & Agriculture, Sacramento, CA, U.S.A.*) and T.M. Rodriguez (*Santiago, Chile*) on 27 July 2006. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 64: 43–44 (March 2007). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. One supportive comment and one comment with author's amendment to the application were published in BZN 64(2): 124.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2007 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 64: 44. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2008 a majority of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (11 For, 9 Against), but this failed to reach a two-thirds majority required for approval. In accordance with the Bylaws it was sent for a revote on 1 September 2008. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2008 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 5: Krell, Lim, Patterson, Štys and Zhang.

Negative votes – 15: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Minelli, Pape, Papp, Rosenberg and van Tol.

No vote was received from Ng. Pyle was on leave of absence.

Alonso-Zarazaga, voting AGAINST, said that this case should have been presented as a reversal of precedence under Article 23.9.3, since it was very likely that the requirements of Article 23.9.1.2 were not met, *Dactylozodes* not being a genus of importance except for a few specialists. The authors did not state whether the type species of *Lasionota*, namely *L. quadrifasciata*, was currently deemed to be a member of *Dactylozodes*. The authors failed to evaluate the impact on lepidopteran nomenclature of *Lasionota* Mannerheim being suppressed, since the presently invalid

Lasionota Warren, 1912 would then be valid again. Its replacement name *Isatoolna* Nye, 1975 seemed to have been in common use since its proposal, and the authors had not evaluated the consequences of changing back to *Lasionota* Warren. Bouchet, voting AGAINST, pointed out that *Lasionota* Mannerheim, 1837 could qualify as a nomen oblitum, but the application gave references to only three authors that had used *Dactylozodes* in the last 50 years: Gardner (1989), Moore (1997) and the author of the application Bellamy (1998, 2003, 2006). This was not sufficient, in his view, to protect *Dactylozodes*, and thus he voted in favour of Priority. Halliday said he voted AGAINST the proposal for two reasons. First, no evidence was presented to show whether or not *Lasionota* and *Dactylozodes* were synonymous, except for Lacordaire (1857). The most we could do under these circumstances was to rule that *Dactylozodes* had precedence over *Lasionota* when these names were considered as synonyms, not unconditional suppression of *Lasionota*. Second, the evidence for prevailing usage of *Dactylozodes* was very thin. Apart from papers written by the authors of the present proposal, there were only a handful of usages of *Dactylozodes*. Adherence to the Principle of Priority would not result in any disruption to nomenclature. Pape, voting AGAINST, commented that this was a case relating to the ‘fuzzy’ concept of prevailing usage. He said that the Code had very explicit requirements for reversal of precedence, and when these were not fulfilled there should be very good reasons, i.e. something that went beyond prevailing usage, for a ruling. He did not feel these were presented in the Case and so voted against. Similarly, Rosenberg voted AGAINST with the comment that, according to the application, *Lasionota* had not be used as valid since 1857, but only seven uses of *Dactylozodes* since 1899 were cited, none of them outside the field of systematic entomology. He felt that there was no compelling reason not to follow priority in this case. He pointed out that even if the application was declined by the Commission, if *Dactylozodes* was more widely used than the application suggested, the author could give precedence to *Dactylozodes* under Article 23.9, if enough uses of the name as valid could be found.

No names are placed on Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling and the issue is left open for subsequent workers to follow the precepts of the Code or to make new proposals to the Commission.

Corrigendum to Opinion 2218 (Case 3403)

***Mecistocephalus* Newport, 1843 and *Pachymerium* Koch, 1847 (Chilopoda): current usage conserved by designation of *Mecistocephalus punctifrons* Newport, 1843 as the type species of *Mecistocephalus* Newport, 1843 (BZN 66: 93–94)**

Ruling (2)(a) in Opinion 2218 is to be read as follows:

- (b) *Pachymerium* Koch, 1847 (gender: neuter), type species *Geophilus ferrugineus* Koch, 1835, by monotypy.

Erratum

The correct number for the Opinion on Case 3405 *Trigonostomum* Schmidt, 1852 (Platyhelminthes, TRIGONOSTOMIDAE) and *Trigonostomus* Brenske, 1893 (Coleoptera, SCARABAEIDAE): generic names conserved is 2229.

This has been corrected on the hardcopy and on the PDF before distribution.